

2001

Predicting Partner Violence in College Couples: The Role of Global Self-Esteem, Domain-Specific Self-Esteem, and Jealousy

Alehie Valencia

College of William & Mary - Arts & Sciences

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd>



Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Valencia, Alehie, "Predicting Partner Violence in College Couples: The Role of Global Self-Esteem, Domain-Specific Self-Esteem, and Jealousy" (2001). *Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects*. Paper 1539626334.

<https://dx.doi.org/doi:10.21220/s2-brr3-bx78>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

PREDICTING PARTNER VIOLENCE IN COLLEGE COUPLES:
THE ROLE OF GLOBAL SELF-ESTEEM, DOMAIN-SPECIFIC SELF-ESTEEM,
AND JEALOUSY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Alelhie Valencia

2001

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts


Author

Approved, May 2001


Lee A. Kirkpatrick


Constance J. Pilkington


W. Larry Ventis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
INTRODUCTION	2
METHOD	18
RESULTS	22
DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	42
TABLES	50
APPENDICES	61
VITA	77

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Lee Kirkpatrick, whose ideas and theory provided the framework for this thesis. I greatly appreciated his motivating effect during our weekly meetings, his patience when coursework superceded research, and his tolerance of my many questions. Without his great experience, gentle guidance, and seemingly endless knowledge, this project would not have been completed.

I would also like to thank Dr. Greg Feist and Dr. Constance Pilkington for their role in the development of this research. Their different perspectives brought a great diversity to the current experiment. I would also like to thank them for the time they took to examine and offer suggestions for this thesis.

I am also greatly indebted to my fellow ESPN's, Greg Webster, Christian Waugh, and Brandy Burkett. I would like to thank them for their many helpful comments and insightful discussions of this thesis. Viva la revolución!

Lastly, I would like to express my gratitude to my fellow second year graduate students. They too offered many suggestions and helpful ideas on the current project and the theories upon which it is based. More importantly, however, they provided me with a safe haven when preparation of this thesis became overwhelming.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Descriptive Statistics for Self-Esteem and Aggression Scales	50
2. Correlations Among Self-Esteem Measures and Jealousy	51
3. Correlations Between Student Self-Reports and Partner Reports of Students' Behavior	52
4. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Physical Abuse	53
5. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Psychological Abuse	54
6. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Violence against a Partner	55
7. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Violence against a Competitor	56
8. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Threatening a Competitor	57
9. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Derogation of a Competitor	58
10. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Derogation of a Romantic Partner	59
11. Summary of Self-Esteem Measures Predicting Aggression	60

ABSTRACT

Traditional partner violence research contends that low levels of global self-esteem (SE) are predictive of aggression against a romantic partner (e.g. Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985). The relationship between global SE and other forms of aggression is currently being challenged by proponents of the theory of domain-specific SE (Kirkpatrick & Ellis, 2000). Furthermore, evolutionary perspectives argue that a leading cause of the abuse of a romantic partner is jealousy (e.g. Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982).

The present study was designed to examine the degree to which jealousy, global SE, and domain-specific SE are predictive of psychological abuse, physical abuse, and aggressive mate retention tactics.

Using regression analyses, results revealed that when jealousy is statistically controlled, global SE does not predict aggression against a romantic partner. Results also demonstrated that one domain of SE particularly important in predicting partner violence is collective SE. Specifically, low collective SE predicted the use of physical and psychological abuse of a romantic partner. Furthermore, the findings of this study support the need to collect aggression data from both partners of the couple, as evident by the small correlation between the two sets of reports.

Implications of this study include the need to incorporate jealousy as a possible mediator of the relationship between aggression and different domains of SE. Moreover, prevention researchers should note the buffering effect of social coalitions in the context of partner aggression.

PREDICTING PARTNER VIOLENCE IN COLLEGE COUPLES:
THE ROLE OF GLOBAL SELF-ESTEEM, DOMAIN-SPECIFIC SELF-ESTEEM,
AND JEALOUSY

INTRODUCTION

National surveys estimate that acts of physical violence between spouses occur in one in six homes each year. Women are the recipients of a disproportionate number of these serious violent acts. A minimum of two million women in the United States are severely assaulted annually by their male partners (Straus & Gelles, 1990). Additionally, more than half of the women murdered in the United States are killed by their male partners or ex-partners (Fagan & Browne, 1994). Moreover, these statistics do not only apply to married women. Partner violence is a disturbingly common phenomenon among dating couples. Across studies of dating violence, threats of violence are found in 22-69% of samples (Buss, 2000). Furthermore, between 10-59% of women report actual acts of physical violence in the context of the dating relationship. Sugarman and Hotaling(1989) conducted a review of numerous research studies focusing on pre-marital relationships and found a lifetime incidence of physical abuse for 36% of women. In a diverse sample of never-married individuals ranging from ages 18-30, Stets and Henderson (1991) found that 31% reported being the victim of physical aggression during the past 12 months. Shockingly, Gray and Foshee (1997) found similar prevalence rates (34%) in a sample of dating students in grades 6 through 12. In fact in 1993 in the United States, 600 teenage girls were murdered by their boyfriends (Smith, & Donnelly, 2000).

Due in part to these alarming rates, partner violence researchers focused their investigations on identifying characteristics typical of abusive spouses and their victims.

A review of the spousal abuse literature during the 1980's and early 1990's reveals numerous characteristics associated with partner violence. For example, in a review of more than 400 empirical studies of husband-to-wife violence, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found experiencing or witnessing violence in the family of origin during childhood to be a significant risk factor in predicting later partner abuse. Browning and Dutton (1986) found a lack of assertiveness and a lack of verbal skills to be defining features of the abusive male. Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981) found a significant portion of abusive men to abuse alcohol and/or drugs. Additionally, Browne (1987) identified abusive males as having a suicidal personality. In a study by Straus and Gelles (1990), abusive men also reported abusing children. Furthermore, abusive men commonly endorsed hostility, distorted cognitive perceptions of social cues, and held strong gender-role stereotypes (O'Leary, Malone, and Tyree, 1994). Finally, the trait most relevant to the current study and possibly most often cited by researchers of spousal abuse is low (global) self-esteem (SE) (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996; Currie, 1983; Elbow, 1977; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Gondolf, 1985; Harris, 1988; Mruk, 1999; Myers & Gilbert, 1983).

Goldstein and Rosenbaum (1985) compared groups of maritally discordant, nonviolent husbands and satisfactorily married, nonviolent husbands with abusive husbands and found lower levels of global SE in the abusive group. In addition, abusive husbands perceived their wives' behavior as threatening to their self-concepts, a construct very closely related to SE. In a similar study comparing physically abusive husbands to unhappily married, but non-abusive husbands and happily married, non-abusive husbands, Murphy, Meyer, and O'Leary (1994) found that physically abusive men had

lower levels of SE as measured by the Rosenberg (1965) scale regardless of marital satisfaction. Similarly, Kesner, Julian, and McKenry (1997) found a significant negative correlation between SE and aggression towards a partner in a study of attachment styles. Based on her own literature review, Horsfall (1994, as cited in Jukes, 1999) believes the common denominator between spouse abusers is low SE. However, recent evidence sheds doubt on the soundness of these findings.

Self-Esteem and Aggression in Other Contexts

Conventional wisdom has long regarded low SE as a cause of partner violence and many other forms of aggression. In a review of studies reporting this link, Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) found research associating low SE with violence among gangs, terrorists, armed robbers, siblings, and wife beaters. This relationship is so often cited in the literature that it is no longer challenged, but its validity remains unknown. In his book Men Who Batter Women, Adam Jukes (1999, p. 17) refers to this phenomenon as the “waffle factor” and suggests it stems in part from clinical psychologists making inferences about the motivations of their abusive patients. In fact, careful investigation of the research reveals numerous ambiguous findings. For instance, researchers commonly report an association between aggression and low SE, but later describe the perpetrators as being “narcissistic,” “egotistical,” or “arrogant,” which seems much more indicative of high SE. Baumeister et al. (1996) reviewed numerous articles guilty of such discrepancies. In so doing they developed a predictive model linking a type of high SE -- narcissism -- and aggression.

Baumeister et al. (1996) advocate that it is not low SE that causes aggression, but rather high levels of SE extending to narcissism that are better predictors of violence.

They propose that violence results when others threaten positive views of the self, particularly others perceived to be weaker than the self. Furthermore, they challenged these studies by suggesting that SE, as assessed by global measures such as the Rosenberg (1965) scale, will not be predictive of aggression in most cases, and instead narcissism, in combination with an ego threat, will be more predictive of violence.

In an empirical study, Bushman and Baumeister (1998) found evidence to support this model. They conducted a study in which participants were randomly assigned to receive either positive or negative feedback on an essay they were instructed to write. The feedback was ostensibly provided by another participant in the study. Participants were then given the opportunity to aggress against their evaluator or a third party by blasting them with noise. Results revealed that the combination of narcissism and negative feedback resulted in higher levels of aggression toward the evaluator than those in the other combinations, contradicting the popular belief that low SE predicts violence. Furthermore, global SE did not predict aggression at all.

One important distinction between the Bushman and Baumeister (1998) study and other studies linking SE and aggression was their use of narcissism as a measure of SE. Traditionally, most studies assessing SE have used the ten-item Rosenberg (1965) scale. All the studies cited previously investigating the relationship between partner violence and SE also used the Rosenberg scale or another global SE measure.

Domain-Specific Self-Esteem and Aggression

Recently, researchers have begun to conceptualize SE in yet a different fashion. Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2000) have suggested there may be numerous distinct types of SE. These functionally distinct domain-specific self-esteems are conceptualized using an

evolutionary psychological perspective. Kirkpatrick and Ellis's domain-specificity theory of SE is an expansion of Leary's sociometer theory (Leary & Baumeister, in press; Leary & Cotrell, in press; Leary, Tambor, Terdal, & Downs, 1995). Sociometer theory goes beyond the scope of current SE theories and addresses the functions and nature of SE. Leary and Baumeister suggest that SE serves as an internal index designed to monitor an individual's social inclusion or acceptance in interpersonal interactions. They suggest that this index makes individuals aware of instances when they are in danger of being excluded or rejected from social groups, in essence a signal of deficiency in SE. This warning sign, in turn, results in the individual engaging in behaviors that will lead to being socially accepted and included, and subsequently, to a readjustment of SE back to baseline.

Whereas sociometer theory focuses on a single meter of social inclusion, Kirkpatrick and Ellis contend that we possess numerous "socio-meters" designed to gauge our SE levels in functionally distinct domains. The concept of domain-specific SE is extracted from the evolutionary psychological premise that the mind evolved numerous specialized, domain-specific psychological mechanisms in order to solve different adaptive problems (see Symons, 1992; Tooby & Cosmides, 1992). One or even a few general mechanisms would not have been adequate in solving the highly variable problems faced by our ancestors, and therefore, it is highly unlikely that such a general, all-purpose mechanism would have been passed on to future generations.

Consequently, Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2000) assert that social inclusion is only one aspect of interpersonal relationships monitored by sociometers. Inclusion in cooperative relationships, such as instrumental coalitions, should depend on the strength or value of

that relationship or group to the individual. The strength or value of these groups is usually determined by how these groups compare to competing groups. SE should therefore also be regulated by sociometers that reflect the perceived strength and value of one's groups and interpersonal relationships, as well as one's perceived inclusion in those groups.

However, in non-cooperative relationships where one competes with others for mates or other resources, individuals assess aspects of SE based on how they compare to others in status, superiority, or attractiveness. In these relationships it may not be sufficient to gauge only whether or not one is socially included. Instead, it may be more pertinent to possess a distinct sociometer that gauges one's relative standing on numerous competitive dimensions. From this perspective, SE not only encompasses a measure of social inclusion, especially important in instances of between-group competition, but also a measure of superiority, attractiveness, and status with respect to instances of within-group competition.

Based on this theoretical model of domain-specific SE, we (Kirkpatrick, Waugh, Valencia, & Webster, 2000) set out to replicate Bushman and Baumeister's (1998) study on aggression with some important modifications. In addition to measures of global SE and narcissism, domain-specific measures of SE were included to assess self-perceived superiority, dominance, mate value SE, collective SE, perceived social support, and social inclusion. In addition to this change, we also used a different measure of aggression. In this study, aggression was measured by the allocation of hot sauce, a technique designed by McGregor, Lieberman, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, and Simon (1998). Like Bushman and Baumeister, we found significant effects for gender and ego

threat. In addition, we also found that not only did the global measure of SE again fail to predict aggression, but also two of the domain-specific SE measures (self perceived superiority and social inclusion) revealed significant predictive relationships with aggression. Specifically, the self perceived superiority scale was a positive predictor of aggression, and social inclusion was a negative predictor of aggression. Like Bushman and Baumeister, we found a more complex relationship between SE and aggression. These findings provided further evidence that the relationship between SE and aggression is not necessarily a linear one and can, in fact, include both positive as well as negative dimensions.

Study two of Kirkpatrick et al. (2001) found further support for the domain-specificity of SE. Waugh used the previously described SE measures, as well as the same measure of aggression (hot sauce allocation), but he incorporated a different ego threat. In his study participants' mate value SE was threatened when they were asked to participate in a bogus dating game where they had to compete with (ostensibly) other single participants of the same gender in order to advance to the final stage where they would participate in a taste test with an individual of the opposite sex. Once again, a positive relationship between aggression and a specific domain of SE emerged. Specifically, high mate value SE was positively related to aggression towards a competitor. In addition, global SE was again not predictive of aggression.

Self-Esteem and Partner Violence

Using their model of aggression and SE, Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) theorized that high levels of SE, specifically narcissism, would be predictive of most types of aggression, with one exception. They believe that partner abuse is the one area

of aggression that could be better explained by low levels of SE in the perpetrator. In this particular case, Baumeister et al. (1996) are in accord with other domestic abuse researchers but not for the same reasons. They believe that men who attack women or children might have low SE, not because low SE causes violence, but because low SE causes them to victimize someone who is unlikely to retaliate. They point out that some causes of violence may have little to do with SE, and people at all levels of SE may be aggressive. Since it would seem that one needs a substantial level of confidence to attack a powerful person, then perhaps an individual with aggressive tendencies but low confidence would be more likely to choose a weaker target, such as a female partner or a child.

Baumeister et al. (1996) do not present any further arguments for their reasoning. In their more general theory of aggression, they suggest that high levels of narcissism are what cause some individuals to be more susceptible to ego threats. However, Baumeister et al. do not explain why partner abusers would not have high levels of narcissism or what individual-level variables make partner abusers more susceptible to ego threats. Aside from their vague reference to “confidence,” no other variables are offered as possible explanations for this expected inverse relationship between SE and aggression in the context of romantic relationships. Furthermore, they also neglect to offer possible ego threats that could trigger an aggressive response against a romantic partner. Their model calls for a combination of high narcissism in combination with an ego threat. However, the researchers offer no suggestions of what the ego threat(s) could be in this particular context. Fortunately, the evolutionary perspective sheds light on a possible ego threat that

could result in partner violence. The threat of a romantic partner leaving or compromising the success of the relationship could be the ego threat of importance in this context.

Evolutionary Theory and Partner Violence

Some evolutionary theorists, such as Buss and Shackelford (1997), adopt a view similar to Baumeister et al. and other traditional partner violence researchers in explaining this phenomenon. Instead of SE, Buss and Shackelford focus on a discrepancy in a specific domain of SE – mate value. A discrepancy in mate value indicates that one partner in the couple perceives him/herself as superior to his/her partner in different dimensions often sought out by members of the opposite sex. In a study relating the use of mate retention tactics and mate value, Buss and Shackelford (1997) found that mates who perceived themselves as lower in mate value than their partners engaged in more mate retention tactics. Mate retention tactics are actions in which people often engage to keep their partner interested in them. These tactics can range from acts of vigilance to acts of severe violence and, in more extreme cases, even murder. Buss and Shackelford argue that when the possibility of a partner deflecting from the relationship is heightened, the individual still interested in pursuing the partnership may incorporate more mate retention tactics than normal, possibly even resorting to the more aggressive tactics of retention. In a way, the person in the relationship who more frequently engages in acts of mate retention can be seen as perceiving his/her partner as a more valuable romantic partner than him/herself and therefore, also more likely to end the romantic relationship in pursuit of a more equally valuable partner. This view also argues for a negative relationship between SE, specifically low mate value SE, and aggression.

However, Valencia (1998) did not find this negative relationship between aggression towards a partner and SE. This study focused on the mating domain of SE in relation to partner violence in college couples. Participants were asked to rate themselves and their partners on a mate value scale and give frequency rates of tactics used in solving relationship conflicts drawn from Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactics Scale. When discrepancy scores for participant and partner were calculated for mate value ratings, I found that those males perceiving themselves or perceived by their partner as having high mate value also had higher frequency scores on more aggressive conflict resolution tactics. In these cases, higher mate value in males was correlated with a higher frequency rate of partner abuse. This finding contradicts other partner abuse research that purports that low SE causes aggression (e.g. Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Murphy et al., 1994; Kesner et al., 1997) as well as Buss and Shackelford's hypothesis that this type of aggression would be most likely endorsed by partners with low mate value.

Further support for the role of domain-specific SE in partner aggression was found by Valencia (2000). That study examined domain-specific SE as a predictor of partner violence in a college sample. Participants provided self-reports of physical abuse used against a partner, mate retention tactics used to keep a partner, and the types of conflict resolutions used in solving relationship problems. Participants were also asked to rate themselves on global value, mate value, superiority, social dominance, social inclusion, and membership in valued groups, or collective esteem. In addition to these self-reports, participants were also asked to provide evaluations of their partner on the same domain-specific measures as well as the global SE scale. Otherwise stated, participants rated the degree to which they thought their partner had high global SE, mate

value SE, social inclusion, social dominance, superiority, and collective SE. These ratings were indications of their esteem of their partner (i.e., partner esteem), as opposed to their perceptions of what they believed their partner felt about him/herself. Both participant SE and partner esteem on all of these scales were then used to predict the use of abuse against a partner, mate retention tactics, and a dominating conflict resolution style. Additionally, participant SE scores and partner esteem scores were compared for discrepancies in order to further examine Buss and Shackelford's (1997) findings. Results showed that individuals who reported high levels of social dominance, but low levels of social inclusion, were more likely to engage in mate retention tactics involving violent or controlling acts against their romantic partner. Furthermore, individuals who rated themselves highly on mate value SE and social dominance were also more likely to report using aggressive mate retention tactics against potential sexual rivals.

Discrepancies between participant self-reports and reports of their partner's collective esteem were indicative of an increased use of aggressive tactics against competitors.

This study provided additional support for the incorporation of domain-specific SE measures in predicting partner violence. As was found in Kirkpatrick et al. (2000), domain-specific SE measures differentially predicted instances of partner abuse. Both studies demonstrated the importance of the between-group competition aspects (i.e., social inclusion) and the within-group competition aspects (i.e., social dominance/self-perceived superiority) of SE. Furthermore, Valencia (2000) partially replicated Waugh's (2000) findings. Both of these studies revealed the importance of mate value SE as a positive predictor of aggression in the mating context. This last finding also presented an

alternative to Buss and Shackelford's hypothesis relating to mate value discrepancies and the use of mate retention tactics.

Jealousy and Partner Violence

Aside from domain-specific SE, evolutionary theory also asserts that jealousy and the apprehension of partner infidelity play an equal, if not greater, role in predicting aggression against romantic partners. According to evolutionary theory, jealousy is a solution to the gender-specific problem of paternity uncertainty for males and the securing of resources for females (Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982). Jealousy is believed to motivate behaviors that are designed to repel sexual competitors or dissuade mates from engaging in infidelity. From this perspective, partner violence can be seen as a behavior motivated by jealousy and used to dissuade or coerce a romantic partner from leaving the relationship or engaging in other mating relationships. Support for this perspective is seen in many empirical studies that find jealousy is the leading cause or precipitating context of aggression against a partner (e.g. Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982). Wilson and Daly (1996) hypothesize that romantic partners, especially men, use violence and threats of violence as a strategy to decrease the odds of their partner committing infidelity or ending the relationship. Non-evolutionary-based partner violence research has also found a similar relationship between aggression against romantic partners and jealousy. Dobash and Dobash (1984) report that women seeking refuge in shelters often cite extreme jealousy on the part of their partner as the key cause of the abuse. Anecdotal reports of perpetrators of this abuse also support the link between jealousy and partner violence. Due to the role of jealousy in the context of partner

aggression suggested by the previous studies, jealousy was seen as warranting further examination and therefore included as an additional predictor in the current study.

The traditional partner violence research contends that low global SE predicts aggression against a romantic partner, whereas the evolutionary psychology research suggests jealousy predicts the same behavior. However, the relation between these two predictors remains to be established. Bringle and Phillips (2000) conducted a meta-analysis focusing on the relationship between jealousy and global SE. Their meta-analysis revealed similar findings to those observed by Baumeister et al. (1996) when investigating the relation between SE and aggression. Specifically, some researchers reported finding negative relations between jealousy and SE, whereas others reported finding a positive relation between the two variables. Bringle and Phillips concluded that the overall degree of association in past research between jealousy and SE was a low $r = -.23$. Therefore, it remains to be seen if the relationship between SE and jealousy in the specific context of partner abuse is somehow confounded. For instance, if global SE only emerges as a predictor when jealousy is controlled, then this would suggest that jealousy mediates the relation between global SE and aggression against a partner. Therefore, studies focusing on only one of these variables individually would not be an accurate representation of the abusive relationship. In light of this ambiguity, the current study was designed to test the predictive validity of both variables in respect to partner aggression.

Present Study

The present study was conducted to further investigate the complex relationship between partner aggression and global SE, domain-specific SE, and jealousy. This study

was also conducted as an extension of Valencia (2000) and to aid in establishing the validity of domain-specific measures of SE as predictors of partner violence.

Furthermore, the present study combined aspects relevant to traditional partner violence research with aspects advanced by evolutionary theory. Finally, in consideration of the limitations of Valencia (2000), a few methodological changes were incorporated.

As was done in Valencia (2000), the current study included both global and domain-specific SE measures and Buss's (1988) Mate Retention Tactics Scale. However, in the present study Shepard & Campbell's (1992) Abusive Behavior Inventory (ABI) replaced Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). This change was made due to some of the limitations inherent to the CTS. For instance, the CTS was established to assess general conflict within a family network. In contrast, the ABI can be used to assess violence in both dating and marital relationships.

In addition, the CTS solely focuses on physical abuse, whereas the ABI assesses physical as well as psychological abuse. The area of psychological abuse has long been neglected in the partner abuse literature. However, recently Marshall (1997) and Shepard & Campbell (1992) have begun to more closely examine non-violent abuse, including psychological abuse and verbal abuse. The current study was designed to follow suit by expanding the scope of the domain-specificity of SE to include its relationship with psychological abuse as well as physical abuse.

The Valencia (2000) study involved one severe shortcoming: the study was designed to only record reports of aggression as provided by one person in the couple. The current study was designed to rectify this limitation by including reports from both individuals in the couple. The availability of two distinct sets of reports allowed for

further improvement upon much of the literature and further investigation of a gender debate currently present in the partner violence research arena.

Currently, the literature lacks unequivocal evidence of the presence of gender differences in partner aggression. Many proponents of studies focusing on family conflicts strongly contend that both sexes are equally aggressive (Arriaga & Oskamp, 1999; Fiebert, 1997; Straus, 1997). In contrast, other researchers focus more closely on crime studies, which are more suggestive of males using greater violence against their partners.

This gender differences debate is further compounded by the common use of pre-selected samples in studies of partner violence. Many studies in this area commonly utilize samples of wife batterers referred to treatment centers for counseling or abusers legally bound to undergo therapy after arrest for spousal battery. Other studies use samples of abused women seeking refuge in women's shelters after a recent bout of abuse. Clearly, such pre-selected samples are not generalizable to the population in that it is unfortunately not common for the abuser to be referred to treatment and it is just as unlikely for abused women to seek shelter from their abusers in these type of public settings. Furthermore, reports from both of these samples may be questionable. The abuser's reports may be understated to avoid social judgment or punishment, whereas the victim's reports may be either overstated, to gain sympathy, or underestimated due to rationalization and justification of the abuse.

More recently other researchers are attempting to decipher distinct types of violence against romantic partners, such as verbal abuse and psychological abuse (Arias & Pape, 2000; Makepeace, 1986; Peterson, 1997; Stets, 1990; Tjaden & Thoennes,

1997). These researchers tend to adopt the proposition that the violence that men engage in differs from that in which females engage. Therefore, asserting that men and women are equally aggressive towards their romantic partners is overly simplistic and unjustifiable.

A final difference between the current study and Valencia (2000) was the inclusion of White's (1981) Chronic Jealousy Inventory. This change was made in order to incorporate evolutionary theory into the study of partner violence, as well as to investigate its effect on the relationship between global SE and aggression commonly documented. Evolutionary theory arguably has one of the strongest theories regarding conflict between the sexes and was therefore included in predicting the context in which partner violence would more commonly occur.

Based on the previous research discussed, the present study tested the following predictions:

1. Jealousy was expected to be a stronger predictor of partner violence than global SE. Specifically, jealousy was expected to be positively related to reports of aggression. Therefore, individuals who perceived themselves or are perceived by their partners to have high levels of chronic jealousy will also be more likely to report or have their partners report greater instances of aggression.

2. Global SE was expected to be unrelated to measures of partner violence and other forms of aggression in analyses controlling for jealousy.

3. Domain-specific measures of SE were predicted to be superior predictors of partner violence when compared to global SE. In light of previous findings on the relation between domain-specific SE and aggression (Kirkpatrick, et al., 2000; Valencia,

2000; Waugh, 2000), it was predicted that superiority and mate value SE would be positive predictors of aggressive acts, whereas social inclusion and collective SE would be negative predictors of aggressive acts.

4. The final prediction focused on investigating discrepancies between reports of each individual in the couple. It was predicted that the two sets of reports would not be fully congruent. Specifically, I predicted that the abuser would underestimate the instance of abuse. No prediction was made about the estimate of the victim due to ambiguities regarding the thought processes a victim may hold about his/her victimization.

Method

Participants

The sample in the present study consisted of students at a state university and their romantic partners. Students were selected from a mass-testing database including most students enrolled in Introductory Psychology courses. Of these students, those involved in a committed, heterosexual romantic relationship for at least three months prior to testing were recruited for participation. Students were contacted by email and invited to participate in exchange for partial course credit. The final pool consisted of 141 students (90 women and 51 men). The majority of students were white, and ages ranged between 18-22.

In an initial email inviting students to participate in the present study, students were instructed to provide an email address for their partners, to be used to contact and invite the partners to participate in the study as well. Partners were then contacted via email and invited to participate in exchange for payment of five dollars. The final pool of

partners consisted of 101 partners (46 women and 55 men), resulting in a total of 101 couples with matching data.

Materials

Materials consisted of a battery of ten questionnaires posted on the Internet. The questionnaires took approximately one half hour to complete. Students responded to questions based on their self-perceptions of their own behaviors and beliefs. Partners completed the same questionnaires twice, first based on their self-perceptions of their own behaviors and beliefs, and then based on their perceptions of their partner's behaviors and beliefs. The following questionnaires were used as dependent variables and were completed by both the students and their partners (See Appendix B for individual scale items.):

The Abusive Behavior Inventory (ABI) (Shepard & Campbell, 1992) assessed the use of psychological and physical abuse in the romantic relationship. Questions were stated as "How often did X happen in your romantic relationship during the past six months?" followed by a list of behaviors ranging from "called your partner a name or criticized your partner" to "used a gun, knife, or other weapon against your partner." Responses were provided using a Likert scale from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Frequently).

Mate Retention Tactics (MRT). Another scale of aggressive tactics used in the current study adopted from Valencia (1998) included a behavioral checklist of acts people engage in to prevent their partner from leaving the relationship or to encourage their partner to stay. Drawing from a checklist of 104 acts, Buss (1988) developed a taxonomy of mate retention tactics. This taxonomy consisted of two large umbrellas: a) acts aimed at competitors and b) acts aimed at the partner. This checklist assessed the

frequency with which participants engaged in each of the acts included in Buss's taxonomy. Of the 15 MRT subscales included in Buss's measure, only those relevant to the construct of aggression were included in the present analyses. These include: violence against a romantic partner, violence against a competitor, threats of violence against a competitor, derogation of a competitor, and derogation of a romantic partner. Students and partners were each instructed to report how often they had performed each act within the last 6 months. Partners were also instructed to report how often the student performed each act. Sample items included were: "I called her at unexpected times to see who she was with," "I yelled at another woman who looked at him," and "I picked a fight with a man who seemed interested in her." Responses were given using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always).

The following questionnaires were completed only by the students and were used to measure the independent variables (See Appendix A for individual scale items.):

Self-Esteem Scales. Measures of SE included on the website were taken from the Kirkpatrick et al. study (2000). These included Rosenberg's (1965) global SE scale and the numerous domain-specific SE scales representative of the three major dimensions depicted by Kirkpatrick and Ellis (2001):

1. Social Inclusion was assessed using two measures previously employed for this purpose by Leary and Cottrell (1999): the nine-item Inclusionary Status Scale (Spivey, 1990) and the ten-item Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (Cohen, Mermelstein, Kamarck, & Hoberman, 1985). Given their apparent item overlap and high intercorrelation, these were combined into a single measure by computing the unweighted mean of the two scale scores.

2. Three different facets of competitive SE were assessed using (a) Pellham and Swann's (1989) Self-Attributes Questionnaire, on which students rated themselves in terms of percentile ranks on ten socially desirable characteristics (hereafter referred to as self-perceived superiority); (b) a ten-item measure of social dominance adapted by Leary and Cottrell (1999) from the California Psychological Inventory (Megargee, 1972); and (c) a 12-item measure of self-perceived mate value developed by Williams (1999).

3. Between-group competitive SE was assessed using the 16-item Collective Self-Esteem scale developed by Luhtanen and Crocker (1992). Responses to all scales were provided using standard Likert-style scales.

Finally, the Chronic Jealousy Scale (White, 1981) was completed by both partners in each couple. Students provided self-reports of their jealousy, whereas partners provided reports of the student's jealousy. Responses were provided using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Sample items included "I am generally a jealous person," and "My jealous feelings have been a problem in my romantic relationships."

Student reports and partner reports of jealousy were significantly correlated ($r = .31$). In an effort to avoid problems of multicollinearity, the student-report and partner-report were aggregated into one jealousy variable to be used as a predictor in subsequent analyses.

Procedure

Participants were instructed via email to go to a website. Once on the website, students were instructed to log on using their college id. Partners were instructed to log on using their partner's college id in order to yoke the student-partner data. After reading

consent forms, participants were instructed to click on an “I Agree” box to signify consent to participate. Confidentiality was assured, and participants were given the option of completing the study in the privacy of their own home, as long as they did not share answers with their partners. Participants were then presented with one to three questionnaires per web page. Upon completion of the questionnaires, participants were thanked and debriefed online.

Partners of students were given three payment receipt options: payment to be mailed, payment to be picked up by partner, or payment to be picked up by student and delivered to partner.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for dependent and independent variable measures for both student reports and partner reports can be found in Table 1.

Preliminary Analyses

The Abusive Behavior Inventory (Shepard & Campbell, 1992) assesses both physical and psychological abuse. Means were calculated separately for each type of abuse. Examination of the frequencies and distributions for each subscale revealed that their distribution was severely positively skewed. Seventy-six percent of the sample reported no incidence of physical abuse, and 25% reported no incidence of psychological abuse. To correct for this skewed distribution, a log transformation was performed to produce a more normal distribution. This transformation was mostly successful for the psychological abuse subscale. However, in spite of the logarithmic transformation, the distribution still contained a severe outlier. In lieu of eliminating this individual’s data

from the analyses, the individual's score was converted into the next highest score on this variable.

Logarithmic transformation was also attempted on the physical abuse subscale but was not successful in producing a more normal distribution due to the relatively low incidence report of this type of abuse. Consequently, the physical abuse variable was converted into a dichotomous variable that indicated simply the absence or presence of any type of physical abuse.

Log transformations were also performed on five of the 15 Mate Retention Tactics subscales, which displayed severely skewed distributions. As with the physical ABI subscale, this transformation was not fully successful in yielding a more normal distribution, due to the fact that over 50% of participants reported never engaging or experiencing the behaviors described in the items in these subscales. Therefore, the following subscales were also dichotomized: violence against a romantic partner, violence against a competitor, threats of violence against a competitor, derogation of a competitor, and derogation of a romantic partner.

An internal consistency reliability analysis was performed on each of the SE scales. All scales showed adequate reliability with alpha coefficients ranging from .70 to .85. Internal consistency reliability analyses were also performed on the abuse measure, the jealousy measure, and the five mate retention tactics. Alpha coefficients for both student reports and partner reports of the abuse scale ranged from .93 to .94, and alpha coefficients for the jealousy measure ranged from .89 to .91. Alpha coefficients for the mate retention tactics ranged from .62 to .75. These latter coefficients are smaller due to the lower number of items per subscale.

Correlations were calculated among all of the independent variables including all of the SE scales, and the jealousy scale. All SE scales were positively and significantly correlated ($p < .05$), and jealousy was marginally related to the superiority measure. (Recall that the variable jealousy is now an aggregation of the student self-report and the partner-report of the student's jealousy.) These correlations are depicted in Table 2.

Correlations were also calculated between student self-reports and partner reports of the students' abuse, mate retention tactics, and jealousy. Most correlations were significant ($p < .05$), and all significant correlations were positive. However, the correlations were relatively small in magnitude. See Table 3 for these correlations.

The small magnitude of the correlations suggested two factors. First, the low correlations between student and partner reports implied that there was substantial disagreement between the two individuals in the couple over the occurrence of the each of the aggressive behaviors measured. Rather than assuming one set of reports was more accurate and impartial than the other, I created a new variable for each set of dependent variables measured that aggregated both partner and student reports of these variables. Combining the two reports in this manner arguably resulted in a less biased representation of the occurrence of aggressive behaviors within the romantic relationship. These correlations can be found along the diagonal of Table 3.

Second, the small magnitude of the correlations among the dependent variables suggested that each variable, in fact represented a unique and separate set of aggressive behaviors, rather than a replica of the other dependent variables. These correlations are presented above the diagonal for partner reports and below the diagonal for student reports in Table 3.

Gender Effects

Chi-square tests were calculated on the physical abuse subscale of the ABI and the five MRT subscales to investigate the presence of gender differences. Unlike most past research, the chi-square test found no evidence of a gender difference in physical abuse, $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 1.18, p = .28$. In addition, no gender effects were found for the five MRT subscales, $\chi^2(1, N = 123) = .24, p = .62$; $\chi^2(1, N = 98) = .11, p = .71$; $\chi^2(1, N = 117) = .05, p = .84$; $\chi^2(1, N = 122) = .24, p = .62$; $\chi^2(1, N = 112) = 1.49, p = .22$. However, the prevalence rates in this sample may have suffered from a floor effect, in that instances of abuse and other forms of aggression were initially so low for both men and women that a proper comparison between the two groups was not possible. The absence of a gender effect in this sample should be viewed cautiously.

A t-test was performed on the psychological abuse subscale to investigate the presence of gender differences in this type of abuse. As seen in previous research, incidence rates were much higher for this measure. Interestingly, females more often than males reported engaging in psychological abuse against their romantic partners ($M = .40, SD = .25$), $t(140) = -2.41, p < .05$. This finding is consistent with more recent research (Marshall, 1996).

Data Analysis Plan

Regression analysis was used to find the predictors of psychological abuse, physical abuse and the five MRT subscales relevant to violence. Three distinct reports (student-report, partner-report, aggregated report) were provided for each of the seven dependent variables noted above, resulting in 21 dependent variables.

Two-tiered regression analyses were performed in predicting each of these 21 dependent variables. Regression analyses were structured in a manner that allowed for the testing of the three main predictions of this study. For each dependent variable, the first regression model consisted of an equation that controlled for sex and included only global SE and jealousy as predictors. This equation was run separately for each dependent variable and for each type of report. The setup of this equation allowed for investigating the predictive validity of global SE, which is commonly used in much of the partner violence research, and jealousy, which is a common predictor tested in the partner violence research using an evolutionary psychology perspective.

The second regression equation run for each of the 21 dependent variables again included global SE and jealousy, but also added the domain-specific SE measures as possible predictors. The setup of this equation allowed for investigation of the predictive validity of each of the domain-specific SE measures in relation to the partner violence domain, while statistically controlling for the previously entered variables.

Results of both regression equations for each dependent variable are partitioned into analyses comparing global SE and jealousy, global SE and domain-specific SE, and student-reports and partner-reports. Each of these three sections details findings for student-report, followed by partner-report, and lastly, aggregated reports. Please refer to Tables 4-10 for a detailed comparison of the results of the separate regression analyses run for each dependent variable and Table 11 for a summary of significant predictors.

Global SE vs. Jealousy

The hypothesis that jealousy would be a stronger predictor of the dependent variables was strongly supported across all three sets of reports. In the analyses

incorporating student self-reports, jealousy proved to be a stronger predictor than global SE for five of the seven dependent variables. Jealousy and sex were both positive predictors of psychological abuse ($\beta = .33, p < .00$; $\beta = .19, p < .05$); refer to Table 5. Jealousy was also the strongest predictor of partner violence ($\text{Wald} = 1.44, p < .001$), threats of violence against a competitor ($\text{Wald} = 9.85, p < .01$), derogation of a competitor ($\text{Wald} = 6.90, p < .01$), and derogation of a mate ($\text{Wald} = 6.58, p < .01$); these analyses can be found in Tables 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, respectively.

Similarly, in the analyses predicting partner-report variables, jealousy emerged as a significant predictor for six of the seven dependent variables. This set of analyses found jealousy to be a strong and significant predictor of psychological abuse ($\beta = .50, p < .001$), partner violence ($\text{Wald} = 13.39, p < .001$), threats of violence against a competitor ($\text{Wald} = 11.01, p < .001$), derogation of competitors ($\text{Wald} = 11.58, p < .001$), and derogation of mate ($\text{Wald} = 5.67, p < .05$); these analyses can be found in Tables 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, respectively. In addition to replicating the findings of the student self-report analyses, partner-report analyses also revealed jealousy to be a significant predictor of physical abuse ($\text{Wald} = 4.79, p < .05$). Refer to Table 3 for further details.

Regression analyses conducted on the aggregated (i.e., self and partner) reports produced the same results found in the analyses of the student self-reports. Global SE did not emerge as a significant predictor for any of the seven dependent variables, and jealousy emerged as a positive predictor for five of these same dependent variables. Results showed that jealousy positively predicts psychological abuse ($\beta = .42, p < .001$), partner violence ($\text{Wald} = 14.98, p < .001$), threats of violence against a competitor ($\text{Wald} = 11.71, p < .01$), derogation of a competitor ($\text{Wald} = 7.92, p < .01$), and

derogation of a mate (Wald = 5.98, $p < .05$); these analyses can be found in Tables 4, 6, 8, 9, and 10, respectively. Unlike the analyses performed on the partner reports, the aggregated-report analyses did not reveal jealousy to be a significant predictor of physical abuse. Findings of these analyses paralleled the findings of the student self-report more closely than the partner-report analyses.

Global SE vs. Domain-Specific SE

The second regression equation used in the hierarchical regression analyses for each dependent variable tested the predictive validity of global SE and each individual domain-specific SE measure.

The analyses based on student-report revealed collective SE to be a negative predictor of psychological abuse (beta = $-.30$, $p < .05$); refer to Table 5 for more details. These analyses also revealed a trend approaching conventional levels of significance with negative collective SE predicting physical abuse (Wald = 3.27, $p = .07$); this finding can be seen in Table 4. Additionally, regression analyses performed on student self-reports showed social inclusion to be a positive predictor of the mate retention tactic involving the use of violence against a partner (Wald = 4.41, $p < .05$). Refer to Table 6 for more details.

Analyses of partner-report variables also revealed negative collective SE to be a predictor of psychological abuse (beta = $-.33$, $p < .05$). However, in contrast to the self-report data, negative collective SE reached significance in predicting physical abuse (Wald = 4.56, $p < .05$); see Table 4. A further discrepancy between the partner-report analyses and the student-report analyses lies in the lack of significant findings for social

inclusion in the partner-report. Social inclusion did not emerge as a significant predictor of any of the dependent variables.

The aggregated reports produced results more closely resembling the partner data than the student self-report data in regard to collective SE. This set of analyses revealed collective SE to negatively and significantly predict both physical (Wald = 5.42, $p < .05$) and psychological abuse (beta = -.37, $p < .001$). However, the aggregated reports also resembled the student data in regard to the findings on social inclusion. Social inclusion was revealed to positively predict violence against a competitor (Wald = 4.64, $p < .05$) and derogation of a competitor (Wald = 4.12, $p < .05$). These findings can be further examined in Tables 7 and 9.

As noted earlier, global SE did not predict any of the dependent variables in the original regression equation in any of the three report sets. However, global SE did emerge as a significant predictor in the subsequent regression equation, that is, when other domain-specific measures were controlled.

In accordance with past research, the analyses incorporating student self-reports found global SE to negatively predict partner violence (Wald = 5.19, $p < .05$), and global SE also negatively predicted the derogation of competitors (Wald = 4.47, $p < .05$); refer to Tables 6 and 9. These findings suggest that individuals that rate themselves as having low feelings of self worth also report engaging in violence against their romantic partner and slandering potential sexual rivals.

Once again, partner reports did not replicate the findings of student reports. In fact, global SE did not emerge as a significant predictor of any of the dependent variables reported by partners.

Analyses performed on the aggregated dependent variables showed global SE to be a negative predictor of derogation of competitors ($Wald = 5.66, p < .05$), as found in the student data, but not a predictor of partner violence, which was also found in the student data.

Overall, these findings suggest that individuals lacking membership to coalitions or not valuing their social groups are more likely to aggress physically and psychologically against their romantic partners. Although collective SE significantly predicted abuse, jealousy was the strongest predictor in these analyses as well as in the original analyses. Therefore, it may be that individuals confronted with the perceived ego threat (real or imagined) of a partner leaving the romantic relationship in combination with the perception of not belonging to valued social groups is likely to result in the individual aggressing against their romantic partner, perhaps in an attempt to make the partner stay.

Discussion

The current study was designed to examine the predictive value of global SE, jealousy, and domain-specific SE with respect to partner violence. I hypothesized that jealousy and domain-specific measures would be stronger predictors of partner violence than global SE and that global SE would not be predictive of partner aggression in analyses controlling for jealousy. I also predicted that the two sets of reports of aggression would not be fully congruent. The findings of the current study provided strong support for the hypotheses put forth. Furthermore, this study generally provided empirical evidence consistent with the theory of domain-specific SE.

Global Self-Esteem

As predicted, when jealousy was statistically controlled, global SE was not a significant predictor of any of the dependent variables across student reports, partner reports, and aggregated reports. Conventional wisdom, along with traditional SE research, has long proposed that low SE is a leading cause of many forms of aggression, including abuse against a partner. Despite their argument for the expansion of the concept of SE, Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) still believe that partner abuse is one type of aggression that could be explained by low levels of global SE in the abuser. However, the lack of significant findings on global SE in the current study is incongruent with this hypothesis and with previous partner violence research. This finding suggests the fact that traditional research in the area of partner violence might be misguided, or at a minimum, is incomplete.

Jealousy

The present findings also suggest that conventional theoretical perspectives on partner violence would greatly benefit from adopting a more evolutionary-based framework that includes jealousy as a predictor of this phenomenon. The current study consistently showed jealousy to surpass the predictive ability of global SE in significantly predicting tactics of aggression. Jealousy emerged as a significant positive predictor of violent tactics in student reports, partner reports, as well as aggregated reports.

One reason that such findings are not commonly reported in traditional partner violence research may be due to the fact that many investigators in this area come from a family therapy or feminist perspective. Both of these areas tend to disregard evolutionary approaches, possibly due to a lack of a full understanding of the theoretical framework or

the misconception that such a framework promotes a patriarchal dominance structure and obstructs the advancement of egalitarian movements. However, omitting the evolutionary perspective on partner violence leads to ignoring a robust finding indicating a strong relationship between jealousy and aggression against a romantic partner. Fortunately, advances to combine feminist perspectives with the evolutionary perspective are currently underway (Buss, 1996; Smuts, 1996). The findings of the current study may provide added support for this fusion.

Support for Domain-Specific Self-Esteem

Results showed that domain-specific SE measures possess a predictive validity, with respect to partner violence, above and beyond that of global SE. The inclusion of domain-specific SE measures helps to further identify potential individual-level precursors of this type of abuse. Although in the past, empirical studies have associated low global SE with most types of aggression, the current study, along with studies one and two by Kirkpatrick et al. (2000), and Valencia (2000), suggests a more complex pattern. In Kirkpatrick et al. low self-perceived social inclusion, but high self-perceived superiority predicted aggression against a stranger, and high mate value SE predicted aggression against a sexual rival; Valencia (2000) found high social dominance and low social inclusion predicted the use of aggressive tactics in the romantic relationship. Findings of the present study suggest specifically that low collective, but not global, SE is predictive of both physical and psychological abuse against a partner. The data suggest the abuser is not necessarily suffering from low SE, but rather, he/she is preoccupied by the threat of the romantic relationship, which may be his/her only social coalition, coming to an end due to partner abandonment or partner infidelity. Consequently, it is

this perceived ego threat that results in the aggression. Therefore, it seems that a romantic partner who perceives him/herself as lacking membership in valued social groups and as having high levels of jealousy may be at risk of engaging in partner violence.

A related collective SE finding was also revealed in previous research focusing on domain-specific SE and partner aggression (Valencia, 2000). In that study, I found that individuals who perceived their partners to have low collective SE, or minimal social coalitions, were more likely to use aggressive tactics in their romantic relationship. The findings of the current study replicated this relationship and suggest that individuals that perceive their own social groups as unworthy or devalued are also more likely to physically and psychologically abuse their romantic partner.

The association between partner violence and coalitional support is not a novel concept. Daly and Wilson (1996) originally proposed a similar hypothesis. They suggested that the presence of social networks, especially family networks, can serve as a protective factor against partner aggression. Empirical evidence supporting this hypothesis was found in a study conducted by Figueredo (1995; as cited in Buss, 1999) that examined the relationship between partner violence and the presence of family within Madrid and in neighboring cities. The significant collective SE findings of the present study provide further empirical evidence in support of Daly and Wilson's hypothesis, along with domain-specific SE theory.

Some of the analyses incorporating domain-specific SE resulted in some unexpected relationships. For instance, social inclusion emerged as a positive, instead of a negative, predictor of violence against competitors (as measured by self-report) and partners and derogation of competitors (aggregated report). Previous empirical studies

incorporating domain-specific SE measures have found low social inclusion to predict aggression on two occasions (Kirkpatrick et al., 2000; Valencia, 2000). It is unclear why this study produced such an incongruent relationship, but one reason may be that a slight change was made in the methodology of the present study. The current study was posted on the Internet. Questionnaires were preceded by a set of general instructions briefly describing the response scale and required method of response. In contrast, the original domain-specific SE studies used the paper-pencil method and provided individual instructions for each measure. Like those provided on the website, most instructions for the paper-pencil study were simply brief descriptions of the response scale. However, the collective SE measure was accompanied by a more detailed set of instructions, following Luhtanen and Crocker (1992). These instructions read:

We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class. We would like you to consider your (partner's) memberships in those particular groups or categories, and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about those groups and your (partner's) memberships in them. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by writing the appropriate number in the space provided using the following scale...

This set of instructions was omitted from the current study in order to simplify the creation of the website. However, this small change may have had serious implications. The collective SE measure was preceded by the social inclusion measure in

the Internet study, and although the two measures are designed to tap into two distinct domains of SE, between-group competition for collective SE and within-group competition for social inclusion, both measures use items relating to social groups; social inclusion measures acceptance in these groups, whereas collective SE measures the value of these groups. Due to the two measures appearing back-to-back and without individual instructions for each, participants may have assumed all items regarding social groups were part of the same questionnaire. In turn, they may have responded to the collective SE items in the same way they answered the social inclusion items.

Another possible explanation for the counterintuitive social inclusion findings is related to the problem of multicollinearity. As shown in Table 1, social inclusion shared a very high correlation with collective SE ($r = .72$), perhaps for those reasons just discussed. In fact, Kirkpatrick et al. (2000) and Valencia (2000) did not observe such high correlations between these measures. The magnitude of this correlation in the present study provides support for the argument that participants provided similar responses for both scales, perhaps due to the placement of the scales and lack of instructions for each. In turn, this multicollinearity may have produced the positive relation between social inclusion and aggression not previously found in other domain-specific SE studies without this multicollinearity.

Despite these methodological problems, there is also a possible theoretical explanation that could account for the positive relationship between social inclusion and aggression against a romantic partner. Domestic violence had long been seen as a private family issue that should only be addressed by the parties involved. With the advent of the feminist movement in the 1970's also came an increased awareness of the severity of

spousal abuse and partner aggression. Research during this era began to reveal that domestic violence was present in all socio-economic spheres, as well as perpetrated by (mostly) males of all status levels. This research provided evidence that it was possible for an otherwise socially accepted and successful male to abuse his romantic partner. The positive relationship between high social inclusion and aggression against a romantic partner found in the present study resonates with such previous findings.

An example of this relationship was recently reported on the local news. A well-liked police officer was arrested for allegedly murdering his ex-wife, a local dance instructor, and her fiancé. The media made a point to interview the man's fellow officers on their feelings toward the alleged perpetrator. Interestingly, the officers all reported being very shocked because the accused was such a nice man. The findings of the present study may suggest that perhaps someone who is well liked and socially included outside of his/her romantic relationship has more status to lose in the event of an ego threat from his/her romantic partner, and therefore, may also be more likely to react aggressively to such an ego threat.

Self- vs. Partner-Reports

Differences in findings between student self-reports and partner reports found in the current study attest to the contention that partner violence research must examine reports of aggression from both members of the couple. Although support was found for the hypothesis predicting differences in reports of aggression between partners and students, the specific nature of underestimation of abuse by the perpetrator was not upheld. There was no such evidence of a systematic disagreement between the two people in the relationship; the partners simply did not completely agree. Regardless, the

findings previously discussed revealed that if perpetrator data alone are investigated, global SE does emerge as a negative predictor of partner violence and derogation of competitors. This finding is consistent with those reported by conventional studies of partner violence, in which low SE is reported to be predictive of aggression. However, as noted above, both partner reports of the students' behaviors and the aggregation of both student and partner reports do not result in the same findings. Global SE did not predict any of the dependent variables in the partner-report analyses or the aggregated-report analyses. Therefore, it seems that much partner violence research has indeed been misguided in declaring global SE to be a negative predictor of this type of aggression. My findings provide strong evidence to support the contention that self-report of the abuser does not depict a complete picture of the occurrence of aggression within the context of the romantic relationship. Researchers should make note of these findings and collect both types of data. Only this type of comparison can fully depict the true nature of the abusive relationship.

Limitations of the Current Study and Future Directions

Although the current research resulted in significant evidence for the hypotheses put forth, it was limited in several important ways. First, although violence data were collected from both partners in a relationship, the data collected only included self-reports and partner reports of violence for one individual in each couple. Otherwise stated, both people in the couple reported on only one person. Though this methodology was a step in the right direction, the ideal data set should include self-reports and partner reports for both people in the couple, totaling two reports for each person. This type of data collection would allow for a more sophisticated analysis that would ultimately aid in

establishing accurate incidence rates as well as clarifying the presence or absence of gender differences.

A second limitation of this study involves the lack of examination of actual behavioral aggression against a partner. Participants in this study simply reported engaging in or not engaging in specific aggressive tactics, but no behavioral measure of aggression was recorded. One research paradigm that could be incorporated in future partner violence studies is Thompson & Richardson's (1983) Rooster Effect paradigm. Their experiment tested for differences in same-sex vs. opposite-sex retaliation behaviors. Incorporating a classic shock paradigm, Thompson and Richardson found that when male participants were excluded from a conversation between a male and a female, they delivered stronger amounts of shock to the female of the dyad. Including such a behavioral measure of aggression could expand on the collective SE and jealousy findings of the present study. In addition, including a behavior measure of aggression could eliminate some of the discrepancies in the defining of aggression as well as alleviate the incidence of under/over-reporting on aggression scales. Furthermore, examining general behavioral aggression in comparison with aggression against a partner may help distinguish between different types of abusers. Perhaps such comparisons may reveal a difference in the type or severity of abuse used by different individuals. For instance, perhaps more generally aggressive individuals may use more severe aggression, whereas individuals exclusively aggressive in the family context may use less severe aggression, or vice-versa.

An additional shortcoming of the present study is that it does not assess who initiates physical violence in the relationship. The literature cites this as one of the severe

limitations of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). Some researchers argue that the absence of initiation data may be partially responsible for the seemingly equal instances of violence reported by both men and women (Makepeace, 1986). They believe that some of the instances of violence reported by women are probably enacted in self-defense.

Although the CTS was not used in the current study, my measures also failed to assess this information. A scale of partner violence that does record this information does not seem to be in existence yet. However, future studies should include a couple of items at the end or beginning of their abuse measures that consider violence initiation. If initiator data were available, arguments for females using aggression solely for self-defense could be further investigated. It would also be interesting to investigate which person initiated the first instance of violence ever experienced in the relationship.

Another limitation of this study involves the ambiguity inherent in conceptualizing violence. The present study revealed that women were significantly more likely to engage in psychological abuse and equally likely as men to engage in physical abuse and other aggressive behaviors. Some research suggests that men and women use different definitions of aggression when responding to items on violence scales (Marshall, 1994). For instance, it has been found that women will occasionally report “beating up” their boyfriends. At first glance, this statement does not seem problematic. However, when this statement is evaluated more logically and objectively, it is probably very unlikely that the average woman can “beat up” the average man. Endorsement by women to such items implies that women may conceptualize “beating up” perhaps as repeated hitting, without consideration of the injury inflicted. In contrast, a man might endorse this item only if actual physical injury occurred. Such differences in the

interpretation of specific acts of aggression only complicate this already delicate topic. It is imperative that researchers create and utilize valid and reliable psychometrics in the study of partner aggression. Otherwise, research findings will not represent an accurate portrayal of the experiences involved in the violent relationship and may even further detract resources from more fruitful research endeavors.

Lastly, another shortcoming of this study involves the use of a trait measure, rather than state measure, of jealousy. Although the CJI (White, 1981) has been established as a valid measure of jealousy and is incorporated in many studies on this variable, it only measures jealousy in a global fashion. The jealousy literature suggests jealousy can also be measured in a state-specific manner. Since the theoretical perspective endorsed in the present study calls for a more domain-specific view, then perhaps this variable should be treated in a similar fashion. It is possible that state jealousy could differentially related to partner aggression when compared to trait jealousy. Future studies might benefit from making a note of this difference in the conceptualization of jealousy.

One interesting avenue not pursued by the present study involves the SE of the abused partner in the relationship. Some researchers believe abused partners develop low SE as a result of their victimization (Lloyd & Emery, 1993). However, in light of the present study and the previous domain-specific SE studies, Lloyd and Emery's findings warrant further examination to decipher what specific domain of SE suffers as a result of being in an abusive romantic relationship. Although this relationship was not directly tested in Valencia (2000), it seems likely that collective SE of the abused partner could be a risk marker for experiencing future partner violence.

Conclusions

The domain-specificity approach has shed light on the relationship between aggression and SE. It has also served in clarifying the discrepancy noted by Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) referring to individuals diagnosed with low SE, but described by their therapists as narcissistic and arrogant. In these instances, domain-specific SE theorists might argue that the narcissistic and arrogant characteristics observed may represent domains regarding superiority, mate value, or social dominance, whereas the low SE characteristics observed may represent domains regarding social inclusion and collective SE.

The finding that domain-specific SE has predictive validity in numerous aggressive contexts, and possibly non-aggressive contexts, as in the case of partner abuse victims, provides a strong foundation for many applied fields, including, but not limited to, marriage and family therapy. Partner violence prevention programs should note the great buffering effects of family support and family presence found in the present study as well as previous research. Family members should be made aware of abuse precursors, such as jealousy and the partner's lack of his/her own social networks, so that they may, in turn, make themselves visible and accessible in the presence of these risk markers. Furthermore, research has found that women often use jealousy induction as a way to keep their partners interested in them (Buss, 1999). Preventative measures should be taken to make sure women are aware of the severity of these seemingly beneficial actions. Lastly, in light of the current findings, perhaps the evolutionary explanation for partner abuse will be more often considered by the traditional partner violence research, resulting in a more comprehensive approach to this complex phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- Arias, I. (1999). Women's responses to physical and psychological abuse. In X. B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), Violence in Intimate Relationships, (pp. 139-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Arriaga, X. B., & Oskamp, S. (1999). The nature, correlates, and consequences of violence in intimate relationships. In X. B. Arriaga, & S. Oskamp (Eds.), Violence in Intimate Relationships. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Boden, J. M. (1998). Aggression and the self: High self-esteem, low self-control, and ego threat. In R. Geen, E. Donnerstein, et al (Eds.), Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy (pp. 111-137). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Baumeister, R. F, Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of self-esteem. Psychological Review, 103, 5-33.
- Bringle, R. G., & Phillips, M. A. (2000). Jealousy and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University - Purdue University, Indianapolis.
- Browne, A. (1987). When Battered Women Kill, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Browning, J., & Dutton, D. (1986). Assessment of wife assault with the conflict tactics scale: Using couple data to quantify the differential reporting effect. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 375-379.

Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *75*, 219-229.

Buss, D. (1988). From vigilance to violence: Tactics of mate retention among American undergraduates. Ethology and Sociobiology, *9*, 191-137.

Buss, D. M. (1999). Evolutionary Psychology: The New Science of the Mind. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Buss, D. M. (2000). The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy is as Necessary as Love and Sex. New York, NY: Free Press.

Buss, D. M. (1996). Sexual conflict: Evolutionary insights into feminism and the "battle of the sexes." In D. M. Buss, & N. M. Malamuth (Eds.) Sex, Power, Conflict: Evolutionary and Feminist Perspectives, (pp. 296-318). New York: Oxford University Press.

Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). From vigilance to violence: Mate retention tactics in married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *72*, 346-361.

Cohen, S., Mermelstein, R., Kamarck, T., & Hoberman, H. (1985). Measuring the functional components of social support. In I. G. Sarason & B. R. Sarason (Eds.), Social support: Theory, research, and applications (pp. 73-94). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *58*, 644-663.

- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and in-group bias. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 60-67.
- Currie, D. W. (1983). A Toronto model. Social Work with Groups, 6, 179-188.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). Homicide. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M., & Weghorst, S. J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. Ethology and Sociobiology, 3, 11-27.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1984). The nature and antecedents of violent events. British Journal of Criminology, 24, 269-288.
- Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. Social Casework, 58, 515-526.
- Fagan, J., & Browne, A. (1994). Violence between spouses and intimates: Physical aggression between women and men in intimate relationships. In A. J. Reiss, Jr., & J. A. Roth (Eds.), Understanding and preventing violence, Vol. 3: Social Influences (pp. 115-292). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of the self-esteem of martially violent men. Family Relations, 34, 425-428.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1985). Fighting for control: A clinical assessment of men who batter. Social Casework, 66, 48-54.
- Hammock, G. S., Richardson, D. R., Pilkington, C. J., & Utley, M. (1990). Measurement of conflict in social relationships. Personality and Individual Differences, 11, 577-583.

Harris, R., Savage, S., Jones, T., & Brooke, W. (1988). A comparison of treatments for abusive men and their partners within a family-service agency. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7, 147-155.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, 101-124.

Jukes, A. J. (1999). Men Who Batter Women. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kessner, J. E., Jullian, T., & McKenry, P. C. (1997). Application of attachment theory to male violence toward female intimates. Journal of Family Violence, 12, 211-228.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Ellis, B. J. (2001). Evolutionary perspectives on self-evaluation and self-esteem. In G. Fletcher & M. Clark (Eds.), The Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Vol. 2: Interpersonal Processes (pp.411-436). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Kirkpatrick, L. A., Waugh, C., Valencia, A., & Webster, G. D. (2001). Self-esteem and aggression: A domain-specific approach. Manuscript submitted for publication, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (in press). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In M. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. San Diego: Academic.

Leary, M. R., & Cottrell, C. A. (1999). Dominance and social acceptance as predictors of self-esteem: Testing predictions of dominance theory and sociometer theory. Unpublished manuscript, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Leary, M. R., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Interpersonal functions of the self-esteem motive: The self-esteem system as a sociometer. In M. H. Kernis (Ed.), Efficacy, agency, and self-esteem (pp. 123-144). New York: Plenum.

Leary, M. R., Haupt, A. L., Strausser, K. S., & Chokel, J. T. (1998). Calibrating the sociometer: The relationship between interpersonal appraisals and state self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 1290-1299.

Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 518-530.

Lieberman, J. D., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & McGregor, H. A. (1999). A hot new way to measure aggression: Hot sauce allocation. Aggressive Behavior, 25, 331-348.

Lloyd, S. A., & Emery, B. C. (2000). The Dark Side of Courtship: Physical and Sexual Aggression. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18, 302-318.

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.

Marshall, L. L. (1994). Physical and psychological abuse. In W. R. Cupach, & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), The Dark Side of Interpersonal Communication, (pp. 281-312). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McGregor, H. A., Lieberman, J. D., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., Simon, L., & Pyszczynski, T. (1998). Terror management and aggression: Evidence that

mortality salience motivates aggression against worldview threatening others. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 590-605.

Megargee, E. I. (1972). The California psychological inventory handbook (pp. 269-287). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mruk, C. J. (1999). Self-Esteem: Research, Theory, and Practice (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.

Murphy, C. M., Meyer, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Dependency characteristics of partner abusive men. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 103, 729-735.

Myers, T., & Gilbert, S. (1983). Wifebeaters' group through a women's center: Why and how. Victimology, 8, 238-248.

Pelham, B. W., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (1989). From self-conceptions to self-worth: On the sources and structure of global self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 672-680.

Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Smith, D. M., & Donnelly, J. (2000). Adolescent dating violence: A multi-systematic approach of enhancing awareness in educators, parents, and society. Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 21, 53-64.

Smuts, B. (1996). Male aggression against women: An evolutionary perspective. In D. M. Buss, & N. M. Malamuth (Eds.) Sex, Power, Conflict: Evolutionary and Feminist Perspectives, (pp. 231-268). New York: Oxford University Press.

Spivey, E. (1990). Social exclusion as a common factor in social anxiety, loneliness, jealousy, and social depression: Testing an integrative model. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-87.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Symons, D. (1992). On the use and misuse of Darwinism in the study of human behavior. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), The adapted mind (pp. 137-159). New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, H. L., & Richardson, D. R. (1983). The rooster effect: Same-sex rivalry and inequity as factors in retaliative aggression. Personality & Social Psychology, 9, 415-425.

Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1992). The psychological foundations of culture. In J. H. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), The adapted mind (pp. 19-136). New York: Oxford University Press.

Valencia, A. (1998). Mate value discrepancies and mate retention tactics: A perspective of partner violence in college couples. Unpublished honors thesis, University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Valencia, A. (2000, June). Discrepancies in domain-specific self-esteem and aggression: A perspective on partner violence in college couples. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Human Behavior and Evolution Society, Amherst, MA.

Vaselle-Augenstein, R., & Ehrlich, A. (1992). Male batterers: Evidence for psychopathology. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives (pp 139-151). Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Waugh, C. E. (2000). Domain-specific self-esteem's role in differentially predicting aggression. Unpublished honors thesis, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

White, G. L. (1981). A model of romantic jealousy. Motivation and Emotion, 5, 295-310.

Williams, T. E. (1999). Domain-specificity of self-esteem: An evolutionary approach. Unpublished M.A. thesis, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Self-Esteem and Aggression Scales

Self-Esteem / Hostility Scale	Student Report		Partner Report	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Global SE	3.94	.61	--	--
Mate Value	2.96	.48	--	--
Superiority	7.25	.91	--	--
Social Inclusion	3.95	.51	--	--
Collective SE	4.81	.44	--	--
Jealousy	2.20	.96	2.23	1.05
Physical Abuse	1.09	.37	1.09	.39
Psychological Abuse	1.50	.47	1.37	.44
Violence Against Partner	1.37	.58	1.34	.58
Violence against Competitor	1.03	.17	1.1	.51
Threats of Violence against Competitor	1.28	.51	1.30	.66
Derogation of Competitor	1.22	.32	1.28	.61
Derogation of Partner	1.18	.33	1.19	.53

Table 2

Correlations Among Self-Esteem Measures and Jealousy

Independent Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Global SE	—	.34**	.50**	.71**	.47**	-.11
2. Mate Value		—	.50**	.40**	.21*	.11
3. Superiority			—	.50**	.30**	-.16 ⁺
4. Social Inclusion				—	.72**	-.02
5. Collective SE					—	-.05
6. Jealousy						—

Note. N = 143.

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

Table 3

Correlations Between Student Self-Reports and Partner Reports of Students' Behavior

Behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Physical Abuse	(.18 ⁺)	.22 [*]	-.05	.09	-.04	.14	.06
2. Psychological Abuse	.24 [*]	(.40 ^{**})	.14	.29 ^{**}	.13	.24 [*]	.39 ^{**}
3. Partner Violence ^a	.21 [*]	.32 ^{**}	(.28 ^{**})	.23 [*]	.18 ⁺	.22 [*]	.18 ⁺
4. Competitor Violence ^a	.27 ^{**}	.40 ^{**}	.15	(.42 ^{**})	.29 ^{**}	.25 [*]	.23 [*]
5. Competitor Threat ^a	.00	.23 [*]	.20	.01	(.34 ^{**})	.23 [*]	.02
6. Competitor Derogation ^a	.03 [*]	.24	.17 ⁺	.24 [*]	.20	(.28 ^{**})	.17
7. Partner Derogation ^a	.14	.34 ^{**}	.15	.05	.14	.14	(.28 ^{**})

Note. ^aMRT = Mate Retention Tactic. Correlations among Student Self-Reports are below the diagonal ($N = 109$); correlations among Partner Reports of Student Behavior are above the diagonal ($N = 105$). Correlations along the diagonal represent the extent of agreement between Student self-reports and Partner reports of the Student.

⁺ $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$.

Table 4

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Physical Abuse

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	B (SE _B)	Wald	B (SE _B)	Wald	B (SE _B)	Wald
Sex	.15 (.42)	.12	-.16 (.53)	.09	.30 (.42)	.54
Jealousy	.40 (.23)	2.98 ⁺	.68 (.31)	4.79 [*]	.30 (.23)	1.64
Global SE	-2.85 (.32)	.79	-.39 (.40)	.92	-.47 (.32)	2.19
Sex	.32 (.44)	.53	.07 (.58)	.02	.43 (.45)	.94
Jealousy	.35 (.24)	2.11	.84 (.34)	5.93 [*]	.24 (.24)	.97
Global SE	-.14 (.50)	.08	-.14 (.73)	.03	-.49 (.49)	.98
Mate Value SE	.50 (.49)	1.04	-.94 (.73)	1.66	.21 (.49)	.19
Superiority	-.01 (.28)	.00	-.43 (.38)	1.23	-.21 (.30)	.48
Social Inclusion	.28 (.75)	.14	1.86 (1.23)	2.28	1.17 (.79)	2.21
Collective SE	-1.23 (.68)	3.27 ⁺	-2.18 (1.02)	4.55 [*]	-1.66 (.71)	5.42 [*]

Note. The top half represents the regression model only including Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full regression model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of three columns represents a separate regression analysis predicting Physical Abuse. The first set represents Student Self-Reports ($N = 143$). The second set represents Partner Reports ($N = 80$). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports ($N = 60$).

⁺ $p < .10$ ^{*} $p < .05$ ^{**} $p < .01$

Table 5

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Psychological Abuse

Variables	Self-Reports			Partner Reports			Joint Reports		
	<u>B</u>	<u>SE_B</u>	β	<u>B</u>	<u>SE_B</u>	β	<u>B</u>	<u>SE_B</u>	β
Sex	.09	.04	.19*	-.01	.05	-.01	.08	.04	.16*
Jealousy	.09	.02	.33**	.17	.03	.50**	.11	.02	.42**
Global SE	-.03	.03	-.08	.02	.04	.06	.00	.03	.00
Sex	.11	.04	.23**	.02	.05	.04	.10	.04	.21**
Jealousy	.08	.02	.30**	.17	.03	.51**	.11	.02	.40**
Global SE	.02	.05	.04	.07	.06	.17	.05	.04	.13
Mate Value SE	-.01	.05	-.01	-.06	.06	-.10	-.01	.04	-.03
Superiority	-.03	.03	-.10	-.02	.04	-.05	-.01	.02	-.05
Social Inclusion	.06	.07	.12	.10	.10	.20	.05	.07	.12
Collective SE	-.16	.06	-.30**	-.20	.08	-.33*	-.19	.06	-.37**

Note. The top half represents the regression model only including Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE.

The bottom half represents the full regression model including the Domain-Specific SE

Measures. Each set of three columns represents a separate regression analysis predicting

Psychological Abuse. The first set represents Student Self-Reports ($N = 143$). The second set

represents Partner Reports ($N = 80$). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and

the Partner Reports ($N = 60$).

* $p < .10$.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Violence against a Partner

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald
Sex	.49 (.41)	1.44	-.57 (.48)	1.40	.39 (.44)	.78
Jealousy	1.09 (.25)	18.53**	1.19 (.32)	13.39**	1.24 (.32)	14.98**
Global SE	-.48 (.33)	2.19	.36 (.39)	.83	.23 (.36)	.41
Sex	.42 (.43)	.94	-.50 (.50)	.99	.31 (.46)	.46
Jealousy	1.02 (.26)	15.27**	1.18 (.33)	12.55**	1.18 (.33)	12.55**
Global SE	-1.15 (.50)	5.19*	.24 (.62)	.15	-.36 (.54)	.45
Mate Value SE	.20 (.50)	.16	.21 (.59)	.13	.88 (.58)	2.29
Superiority	-.30 (.28)	1.08	.33 (.35)	.90	-.08 (.31)	.07
Social Inclusion	1.61 (.76)	4.41*	-.25 (.88)	.08	.59 (.88)	.52
Collective SE	-.56 (.68)	.66	-.06 (.76)	.01	.03 (.74)	.00

Note. The top half represents the model including only Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of two columns (SE_B in parentheses) represents a separate regression analysis predicting Violence against a Partner. The first set represents Student Self-Reports (N = 143). The second set represents Partner Reports (N = 80). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports (N = 60).

*p < .10.

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the MateRetention Tactic Involving Violence against a Competitor

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald
Sex	-.73 (.86)	.74	.09 (.96)	.01	-.12 (.72)	.03
Jealousy	.78 (.50)	2.50	.57 (.53)	1.16	.57 (.41)	1.93
Global SE	-.40 (.69)	.34	.06 (.75)	.01	.18 (.59)	.10
Sex	-.54 (.93)	.33	.34 (1.12)	.09	-.09 (.84)	.01
Jealousy	.76 (.56)	1.81	.91 (.66)	1.91	.68 (.47)	2.10
Global SE	-.57 (1.17)	.24	.04 (1.52)	.00	-.67 (1.17)	.33
Mate Value SE	-.60 (1.28)	.22	-2.63 (1.88)	1.94	-.72 (1.20)	.36
Superiority	-.21 (.54)	.15	-.50 (.69)	.52	-.89 (.56)	2.52
Social Inclusion	2.19 (1.82)	1.46	4.77 (2.71)	3.09 ⁺	4.72 (2.20)	4.64 [*]
Collective SE	-2.43 (1.52)	2.54	-3.92 (2.12)	3.44 ⁺	-3.50 (1.56)	5.05 [*]

Note. The top half represents the model including only Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of two columns (SE_B in parentheses) represents a separate regression analysis predicting Violence against a Competitor. The first set represents Student Self-Reports (N = 143). The second set represents Partner Reports (N = 80). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports (N = 60).

⁺p < .10.

^{*}p < .05.

^{**}p < .01.

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the MateRetention Tactic Involving Threatening a Competitor

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald	<u>B</u> (<u>SE_B</u>)	Wald
Sex	-.09 (.38)	.06	.29 (.49)	.35	.00 (.43)	.00
Jealousy	.71 (.23)	9.85**	1.02 (.31)	11.01**	1.03 (.30)	11.71**
Global SE	.20 (.31)	.42	.39 (.39)	.99	.32 (.36)	.80
Sex	.07 (.40)	.03	.49 (.52)	.88	.05 (.45)	.01
Jealousy	.73 (.24)	9.40**	1.03 (.32)	10.44**	.99 (.31)	10.27**
Global SE	.41 (.47)	.78	.60 (.62)	.95	.77 (.56)	1.93
Mate Value SE	.39 (.47)	.71	.45 (.61)	.53	.82 (.57)	2.13
Superiority	.18 (.26)	.47	.15 (.35)	.19	-.30 (.32)	.88
Social Inclusion	-.16 (.70)	.05	-.24 (.91)	.07	-.23 (.84)	.08
Collective SE	-.96 (.62)	2.42	-.74 (.79)	.88	-.85 (.73)	1.35

Note. The top half represents the model including only Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of two columns (SE_B in parentheses) represents a separate regression analysis predicting Threats against a Competitor. The first set represents Student Self-Reports (N = 143). The second set represents Partner Reports (N = 80). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports (N = 60).

⁺p < .10.

^{*}p < .05.

^{**}p < .01.

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the MateRetention Tactic Involving Derogation of a Competitor

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald
Sex	-.14 (.38)	.13	-.34 (.47)	.52	.15 (.45)	.11
Jealousy	.58 (.22)	6.90**	1.03 (.30)	11.58**	.85 (.30)	7.92**
Global SE	-.35 (.30)	1.32	.02 (.37)	.00	-.37 (.38)	.95
Sex	-.21 (.39)	.28	-.32 (.50)	.40	.10 (.47)	.04
Jealousy	.65 (.24)	7.44**	1.02 (.31)	10.66**	.74 (.33)	5.21*
Global SE	-.99 (.47)	4.47*	-.25 (.60)	.17	-1.51 (.64)	5.66*
Mate Value SE	-.32 (.46)	.49	.48 (.60)	.65	.92 (.63)	2.13
Superiority	.30 (.26)	1.30	-.47 (.36)	1.75	-.01 (.33)	.00
Social Inclusion	.69 (.69)	1.01	1.55 (.94)	2.75 ⁺	1.77 (.87)	4.12*
Collective SE	.24 (.62)	.15	-1.35 (.82)	2.71 ⁺	-.86 (.78)	1.21

Note. The top half represents the model including only Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of two columns (SE_B in parentheses) represents a separate regression analysis predicting Derogation of a Competitor. The first set represents Student Self-Reports (N = 143). The second set represents Partner Reports (N = 80). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports (N = 60).

⁺p < .10.

*p < .05.

**p < .01.

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting the Mate Retention Tactic Involving Derogation of a Romantic Partner

Variables	Self-Reports		Partner Reports		Joint Reports	
	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald	<u>B (SE_B)</u>	Wald
Sex	.34 (.40)	.74	-.13 (.50)	.06	.47 (.41)	1.29
Jealousy	.58 (.22)	6.58**	.70 (.29)	5.67*	.63 (.26)	5.98*
Global SE	.00 (.31)	.00	.02 (.39)	.00	.07 (.32)	.04
Sex	.45 (.42)	1.13	-.11 (.52)	.05	.45 (.42)	1.15
Jealousy	.57 (.24)	5.76*	.75 (.31)	6.11*	.59 (.26)	4.98*
Global SE	-.11 (.47)	.06	.11 (.65)	.03	-.32 (.48)	.45
Mate Value SE	.71 (.48)	2.22	-.51 (.62)	.67	.63 (.49)	1.62
Superiority	.14 (.27)	.28	.01 (.36)	.00	-.03 (.29)	.01
Social Inclusion	.08 (.72)	.01	.17 (.96)	.03	.44 (.76)	.35
Collective SE	-.67 (.64)	1.10	-.09 (.82)	.01	-.09 (.68)	.02

Note. The top half represents the model including only Sex, Jealousy, and Global SE. The bottom half represents the full model including the Domain-Specific SE Measures. Each set of two columns (SE_B in parentheses) represents a separate regression analysis predicting Derogation of a Romantic Partner. The first set represents Student Self-Reports (N = 143). The second set represents Partner Reports (N = 80). The last set represents an aggregate of the Self-Reports and the Partner Reports (N = 60).

⁺p < .10.

^{*}p < .05.

^{**}p < .01.

Table 11

Summary of Independent Variables Predicting Measures of Aggression

Aggression Variables	Student-Report		Partner-Report		Joint Report	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Physical Abuse	+Jealousy*	-Collective*	+Jealousy	+Jealousy -Collective		-Collective
Psychological Abuse	+Sex +Jealousy	+Sex +Jealousy -Collective	+Jealousy	+Jealousy -Collective	+Sex +Jealousy	+Sex +Jealousy -Collective
Violence >> Partner	+Jealousy	+Jealousy -Global +SocInc	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy
Violence >> Competitor				+SocInc* -Collective*		+SocInc -Collective
Threats >> Competitor	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy
Derogation >> Competitor	+Jealousy	+Jealousy -Global	+Jealousy	+Jealousy +SocInc* -Collective*	+Jealousy	+Jealousy -Global +SocInc
Derogation >> Partner	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy	+Jealousy

Appendix A.

Indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each statement below by circling a number from 1 to 5 using the scale provided below.

- | 1. Strongly
Disagree | 2. Disagree | 3. Neither Agree
nor Disagree | 4. Agree | 5. Strongly
Agree |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------|----------------------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I feel that I have a number of good qualities. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I am able to do things as well as most other people. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I feel I do not have much to be proud of. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I take a positive attitude toward myself. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I wish I could have more respect for myself. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I certainly feel useless at times. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | At times I think I am no good at all. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | My opinion of myself tends to change a good deal instead of always remaining the same. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I find that on one day I have one opinion of myself and on another day I have a different opinion. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I change from a very good opinion of myself to a very poor opinion of myself. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I have noticed that my ideas about myself seem to change very quickly. | | | |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | I feel that nothing can change the opinion I currently hold of myself. | | | |

Indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each statement below by circling a number from 1 to 4 using the scale provided below.

1. STRONGLY AGREE 2. AGREE 3. DISAGREE 4. STRONGLY DISAGREE

I sometimes wish I were more physically attractive.

1 2 3 4

Members of the opposite sex seem to like me.

1 2 3 4

I feel as if no one of the opposite sex is 'out of my league.'

1 2 3 4

It surprises me when someone of the opposite sex shows interest in me.

1 2 3 4

I feel that the chances that I would date one of the most popular persons of the opposite sex on campus are very good.

1 2 3 4

In a social situation, I often find that persons of the opposite sex seem to act as if I'm not even there.

1 2 3 4

I find that, after I go out on a date with someone of the opposite sex, that person wants to go out with me on a second date.

1 2 3 4

I do not find it easy to meet people of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4

I often get compliments from people of the opposite sex, even when I don't think that I look especially good.

1 2 3 4

I do not regularly "date" or "see" people of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4

When I start a conversation with someone of the opposite sex whom I do not know, that person usually seems eager to talk to me.

1 2 3 4

I often worry about what people of the opposite sex think about me.

1 2 3 4

This questionnaire has to do with your attitudes about some of your activities and abilities. For the first ten items below, you should rate yourself relative to *other college students* your own age (and sex) by using the following scale:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
bottom	lower	lower	lower	lower	upper	upper	upper	upper	top
5%	10%	20%	30%	50%	50%	30%	20%	10%	5%

An example of the way the scale works is as follows: if one of the traits that follows were “height”, a woman who is just below average in height would circle “E” for this question, whereas a woman who is taller than the 80% (but not taller than 90%) of her female classmates would circle “H”, indicating that she is in the top 20% on this dimension.

intellectual/academic ability	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
social skills/social competency	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
artistic and/or musical ability	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
athletic ability	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
physical attractiveness	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
leadership ability	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
common sense	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
emotional stability	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
sense of humor	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
discipline	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
moral/ethical ideals	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
trustworthiness/loyalty	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
generosity/helpfulness	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
creativity	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
unique talents/abilities	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J

We are all members of different social groups or social categories. Some of such social groups or categories pertain to *gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity*, and *socioeconomic class*. We would like you to consider your memberships in those particular groups or categories, and respond to the following statements on the basis of how you feel about those groups and your memberships in them. There are no right or wrong answers to any of these statements; we are interested in your honest reactions and opinions. Please read each statement carefully, and respond by writing the appropriate number in the space provided using the following scale:

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Disagree somewhat
- 4 = Neutral
- 5 = Agree somewhat
- 6 = Agree
- 7 = Strongly agree

- ___ I am a worthy member of the social groups I belong to.
- ___ I often regret that I belong to some of the social groups I do.
- ___ Overall, my social groups are considered good by others.
- ___ Overall, my group memberships have very little to do with how I feel about myself.
- ___ I feel I don't have much to offer to the social groups I belong to.
- ___ In general, I'm glad to be a member of the social groups I belong to.
- ___ Most people consider my social groups, on average, to be more ineffective than other social groups.
- ___ The social groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am.
- ___ I am a cooperative participant in the social groups I belong to.
- ___ Overall, I often feel that the social groups of which I am a member are not worthwhile.
- ___ In general, others respect the social groups that I am a member of.
- ___ The social groups I belong to are unimportant to my sense of what kind of a person I am.
- ___ I often feel I'm a useless member of my social groups.
- ___ I feel good about the social groups I belong to.
- ___ In general, others think that the social groups I am a member of are unworthy.
- ___ In general, belonging to social groups is an important part of my self-image.

Indicate the degree to which you disagree or agree with each statement below by writing a number between 1 and 5 in the space provided.

- 1 = Strongly disagree
- 2 = Slightly disagree
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 = Slightly agree
- 5 = Strongly agree

- ___ If I decide on a Friday afternoon that I would like to go to a movie that evening, I could find someone to go with me.
- ___ No one I know would throw a birthday party for me.
- ___ There are several different people with whom I enjoy spending time.
- ___ If I wanted to have lunch with someone, I could easily find someone to join me.
- ___ I don't often get invited to do things with others.
- ___ Most people I know don't enjoy the same things that I do.
- ___ When I feel lonely, there are several people I could call and talk to.
- ___ I regularly meet or talk with members of my family or friends.
- ___ I feel that I'm in the fringe in my circle of friends.
- ___ If I wanted to go out of town for the day, I would have a hard time finding someone to go with me.
- ___ I sometimes feel that other people avoid interacting with me.
- ___ I can't rely on my friends or family in times of need.
- ___ People often seek out my company.
- ___ If I want to socialize with my friends, I am generally the one who must seek them out.
- ___ I am fortunate to have many caring and supportive friends.
- ___ Others shun me.
- ___ I think there are many people who like to be with me.
- ___ I often feel like an outsider in social gatherings.
- ___ I feel welcome in most social situations.

CJI (Student Version)

1. I am generally a jealous person.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

2. I often experience jealousy in my romantic relationships.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

3. When I get jealous, that feeling is usually intense.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

4. Those who know me tend to think of me as often jealous.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

5. My jealous feelings have been a problem in my romantic relationships.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

6. I think of myself as a person who can get jealous easily.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

CJI (Partner Version)

7. My partner is generally a jealous person.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

8. My partner often experiences jealousy in our romantic relationship.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

9. When my partner gets jealous, that feeling is usually intense.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

10. Those who know my partner tend to think of him/her as often jealous.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

11. My partner's jealous feelings have been a problem in our romantic relationship.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

12. I think of my partner as a person who can get jealous easily.

Strongly Disagree 1...2...3...4...5 *Strongly Agree*

Appendix B.

ABI (Student Version)

Here is a list of behaviors that many people report have been used by their partners or former partners. We would like you to estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the last six months. Your answers are strictly confidential. Circle a number of each of the items listed below to show your closest estimate of how often it happened in your relationship with your partner during the last six months.

- 1 = NEVER
- 2 = RARELY
- 3 = OCCASIONALLY
- 4 = FREQUENTLY
- 5 = VERY FREQUENTLY

1. Called your partner a name and/or criticized your partner.
2. Tried to keep your partner from doing something your partner wanted to do (e.g. going out with friends, going to meetings).
3. Gave your partner angry looks or stares.
4. Ended a discussion with your partner and made the decision for your partner.
5. Threatened to hit or throw something at your partner.
6. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved your partner.
7. Put down your partner's family and friends.
8. Accused your partner of paying too much attention to someone or something else.
9. Said things to scare your partner (e.g. told your partner something "bad" would happen, threatened to commit suicide).
10. Slapped, hit, or punched your partner.
11. Made your partner do something humiliating or degrading (e.g. begging for forgiveness, having to ask permission to do something).
12. Checked up on your partner (e.g. listened to your partner's phone calls, read your partner's email, called your partner repeatedly).
13. Drove recklessly when your partner was in the car.
14. Pressured your partner to have sex or sex in a way that your partner didn't like or want.
15. Threatened your partner with a knife, gun, or other weapon.
16. Stopped your partner or tried to stop your partner from going to work or school.
17. Threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something.
18. Kicked your partner.
19. Physically forced your partner to have sex.
20. Threw your partner around.
21. Physically attacked the sexual parts of your partner's body.
22. Choked or strangled your partner.
23. Used a knife, gun, or other weapon against your partner.

ABI (Partner Version)

Here is a list of behaviors that many people report have been used by their partners or former partners. We would like you to estimate how often these behaviors occurred during the last six months. Your answers are strictly confidential.

Circle a number of each of the items listed below to show your closest estimate of how often it happened in your relationship with your partner during the last six months.

- 1 = NEVER
- 2 = RARELY
- 3 = OCCASIONALLY
- 4 = FREQUENTLY
- 5 = VERY FREQUENTLY

1. Called you a name and/or criticized you.
2. Tried to keep you from doing something you wanted to do (e.g. going out with friends, going to meetings).
3. Gave you angry looks or stares.
4. Ended a discussion with you and made the decision for you.
5. Threatened to hit or throw something at you.
6. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you.
7. Put down your family and friends.
8. Accused you of paying too much attention to someone or something else.
9. Said things to scare you (e.g. told you something “bad” would happen, threatened to commit suicide).
10. Slapped, hit, or punched you.
11. Made you do something humiliating or degrading (e.g. begging for forgiveness, having to ask permission to do something).
12. Checked up on you (e.g. listened to your phone calls, read your email, called you repeatedly).
13. Drove recklessly when you were in the car.
14. Pressured you to have sex or sex in a way that you didn’t like or want.
15. Threatened you with a knife, gun, or other weapon.
16. Stopped you or tried to stop you from going to work or school.
17. Threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something.
18. Kicked you.
19. Physically forced you to have sex.
20. Threw you around.
21. Physically attacked the sexual parts of your body.
22. Choked or strangled you.
23. Used a knife, gun, or other weapon against you.

MRTS (Student Version)

The following is a list of acts or behaviors people perform in the context of their relationship with their romantic partner. Please circle the number that represents your most accurate estimate of how often you have performed each act within the past 6 months. Use the scale below to answer each item.

- 1 - Never
- 2 - Rarely
- 3 - Occasionally
- 4 - Most of the time
- 5 - Always

1. Called at unexpected times to see who my partner was with
2. Called to make sure my partner was where he/she said he/she would be.
3. Did not let my partner out of sight at a party
4. Questioned my partner about what he/she did while we were apart
5. Had friends check up on my partner
6. Dropped by unexpectedly to see what my partner was doing
7. Refused to introduce my partner to my same-sex friends
8. Read my partner's personal mail
9. Did not let my partner talk to people of the opposite sex
10. Stayed close to my partner while we were at a party
11. Insisted that my partner stay at home with me rather than go out
12. Did not take my partner to a party where others of the opposite sex would be present
13. Insisted that my partner spend all his/her free time with me
14. Took my partner away from a gathering where others of the opposite sex were present
15. Showed interest in others to make my partner angry
16. Spent all my free time with my partner so that he/she could not meet anyone else
17. Talked to someone of the opposite sex at a party to make my partner jealous
18. Monopolized my partner's time at a social gathering
19. Threatened to break up if my partner ever cheated on me
20. Would not let my partner go out without me
21. Hit my partner when I caught him/her flirting with someone else
22. Flirted with someone of the opposite sex in front of my partner
23. Threatened to harm myself if my partner ever left
24. Went out with others of the opposite sex to make my partner jealous
25. Cried in order to keep my partner with me
26. Became angry when my partner flirted too much
27. Ignored my partner when he/she started flirting with others

28. Told my partner I needed a total commitment
29. Said that I would never talk to my partner again if I ever saw him/her with someone else
30. Cut down the appearance of others my partner might be interested in
31. Became jealous when my partner went out without me
32. Told my partner that the person he/she was interested in had slept with nearly everyone
33. Cried when my partner said he/she might go out with someone else
34. Bought my partner an expensive gift
35. Made my partner feel guilty about talking to other men/women
36. Bought my partner some jewelry (e.g., ring, necklace)
37. Told my partner I would "die" if he/she ever left
38. Performed sexual favors to keep my partner around
39. Pleaded that I could not live without my partner
40. Gave in to sexual pressure to keep my partner
41. Told my partner that I was dependent upon him/her
42. Dressed nicely to maintain my partner's interest
43. Asked my partner to marry me
44. Made myself "extra attractive" for my partner
45. Cut down the guy/girl's strength
46. Told my partner that I loved him/her
47. Pointed out to my partner the other guy/girl's flaws
48. Went out of my way to be kind, nice, and caring
49. Told my partner the other guy/girl was stupid
50. Told my partner that I would change in order to please him/her
51. Told my partner the other person was just out to use him/her
52. Acted against my will to let my partner have his/her way
53. Bought my partner a bouquet of flowers
54. Introduced my partner as my boy/girlfriend
55. Took my partner out to a nice restaurant
56. Mentioned to others that my partner was taken
57. Bought my partner a small gift
58. Held my partner's hand when others were around
59. Gave into my partner's sexual requests
60. Put my arm around my partner in front of others
61. Acted sexy to take my partner's mind off others

62. Gave my partner jewelry to signify that he/she was taken
63. Had a physical relationship with my partner to deepen our bond
64. Hung up a picture of my partner so others would know he/she was taken
65. Made up my face to look nice
66. Told others terrible things about my partner so that they wouldn't like him/her
67. Wore the latest fashions to enhance my appearance
68. Told others my partner might have a social disease
69. Was helpful when my partner really needed it
70. Stared coldly at the other person who was looking at my partner
71. Displayed greater affection to my partner
72. Confronted the person who made a pass at my partner
73. Became a "slave" to my partner
74. Picked a fight with the person who was interested in my partner
75. Went along with everything my partner said
76. Vandalized the property of the person who made a pass at my partner
77. Bragged about my partner to others
78. Snooped through my partner's personal belongings
79. Told others the intimate things we had done together
80. Yelled at my partner for showing an interest in others
81. Kissed my partner when others were around
82. Pretended to be mad so that my partner would feel guilty
83. Sat next to my partner when others were around
84. Started a bad rumor about another so my partner would lose interest him/her
85. Asked my partner to wear my clothes
86. Made sure to look nice for my partner
87. Asked my partner to wear my ring
88. Told others how much we were in love
89. Wore my partner's clothes in front of others
90. Told the other person to "stay away" from my partner
91. Told others that my partner was not a nice person
92. Spent a lot of money on my partner
93. Told others my partner was stupid
94. Complimented my partner's appearance
95. Told others my partner was a "pain"

- 96. Gave in to my partner's every wish
- 97. Yelled at others who looked at my partner
- 98. Held my partner closer when others walked in the room
- 99. Threatened to hit the person making moves on my partner
- 100. Gave the other person a dirty look when they looked at my partner
- 101. Hit the person who made a pass at my partner
- 102. Got my friends to beat up the person who was interested in my partner
- 103. Slapped the person who made a pass at my partner
- 104. Got myself pregnant so my partner would stay with me

MRTS (Partner Version)

The following is a list of acts or behaviors people perform in the context of their relationship with their romantic partner. Please circle the number that represents your most accurate estimate of how often your partner has performed each act within the past 6 months. Use the scale below to answer each item.

- 1 - Never
- 2 - Rarely
- 3 - Occasionally
- 4 - Most of the time
- 5 - Always

1. Called at unexpected times to see who you were with
2. Called to make sure you were where you said you would be.
3. Did not let you out of sight at a party
4. Questioned you about what you did while you were apart
5. Had friends check up on you
6. Dropped by unexpectedly to see what you were doing
7. Refused to introduce you to his/her same-sex friends
8. Read your personal mail
9. Did not let you talk to people of the opposite sex
10. Stayed close to you while you were at a party
11. Insisted that you stay at home with him/her rather than go out
12. Did not take you to a party where others of the opposite sex would be present
13. Insisted that you spend all your free time with him/her
14. Took you away from a gathering where others of the opposite sex were present
15. Showed interest in others to make you angry
16. Spent all your free time with you so that you could not meet anyone else
17. Talked to someone of the opposite sex at a party to make you jealous
18. Monopolized your time at a social gathering
19. Threatened to break up if you ever cheated on him/her
20. Would not let you go out without him/her
21. Hit you when he/she caught you flirting with someone else
22. Flirted with someone of the opposite sex in front of you
23. Threatened to harm him/herself if you ever left
24. Went out with others of the opposite sex to make you jealous
25. Cried in order to keep you with him/her
26. Became angry when you flirted too much

27. Ignored you when you started flirting with others
28. Told you he/she needed a total commitment
29. Said that he/she would never talk to you again if he/she ever saw you with someone else
30. Cut down the appearance of others you might be interested in
31. Became jealous when you went out without him/her
32. Told you that the person you were interested in had slept with nearly everyone
33. Cried when you said you might go out with someone else
34. Bought you an expensive gift
35. Made you feel guilty about talking to other men/women
36. Bought you some jewelry (e.g., ring, necklace)
37. Told you he/she would "die" if you ever left
38. Performed sexual favors to keep you around
39. Pleaded that he/she could not live without you
40. Gave in to sexual pressure to keep you
41. Told you that you were dependent upon him/her
42. Dressed nicely to maintain your interest
43. Asked you to marry him/her
44. Made him/herself "extra attractive" for you
45. Cut down the other guy/girl's strength
46. Told you that he/she loved you
47. Pointed out to you the other guy/girl's flaws
48. Went out of his/her way to be kind, nice, and caring
49. Told you the other guy/girl was stupid
50. Told you that he/she would change in order to please you
51. Told you the other person was just out to use you
52. Acted against his/her will to let you have your way
53. Bought you a bouquet of flowers
54. Introduced you as his/her boy/girlfriend
55. Took you out to a nice restaurant
56. Mentioned to others that you were taken
57. Bought you a small gift
58. Held your hand when others were around
59. Gave into your sexual requests
60. Put his/her arm around you in front of others

61. Acted sexy to take your mind off others
62. Gave you jewelry to signify that you were taken
63. Had a physical relationship with you to deepen your bond
64. Hung up a picture of you so others would know you were taken
65. Made up his/her face to look nice
66. Told others terrible things about you so that they wouldn't like you
67. Wore the latest fashions to enhance his/her appearance
68. Told others you might have a social disease
69. Was helpful when you really needed it
70. Stared coldly at the other person who was looking at you
71. Displayed greater affection to you
72. Confronted the person who made a pass at you
73. Became a "slave" to you
74. Picked a fight with the person who was interested in you
75. Went along with everything you said
76. Vandalized the property of the person who made a pass at you
77. Bragged about you to others
78. Snooped through your personal belongings
79. Told others the intimate things you had done together
80. Yelled at you for showing an interest in others
81. Kissed you when others were around
82. Pretended to be mad so that you would feel guilty
83. Sat next to you when others were around
84. Started a bad rumor about another so you would lose interest in him/her
85. Asked you to wear his/her clothes
86. Made sure to look nice for you
87. Asked you to wear his/her ring
88. Told others how much you are in love
89. Wore your clothes in front of others
90. Told the other person to "stay away" from you
91. Told others that you were not a nice person
92. Spent a lot of money on you
93. Told others you were stupid
94. Complimented your appearance

- 95. Told others you were a “pain”
- 96. Gave in to your every wish
- 97. Yelled at others who looked at you
- 98. Held you closer when others walked in the room
- 99. Threatened to hit the person making moves on you
- 100. Gave the other person a dirty look when they looked at you
- 101. Hit the person who made a pass at you
- 102. Got his/her friends to beat up the person who was interested in you
- 103. Slapped the person who made a pass at you
- 104. Got him/herself pregnant so you would stay with him/her

VITA

Alelie Valencia

Born in Brownsville, Texas, October 12, 1974. Graduated from James Pace High School in that city, May 1993. Attended the University of Texas at Brownsville from August 1993 to June 1994. Later transferred to the University of Texas at Austin and graduated May 1998 with a concentration in Psychology. Graduated from the College of William & Mary, 1999-2001, with an M. A. in Experimental Psychology.

The author plans to enroll in a doctoral program in Social/Personality Psychology, and ultimately seek a career in academia.